



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/420,208	10/18/1999	SHANE HERMAN	CSCO-48061	2479

7590 01/05/2006

WAGNER MURABITO & HAO LLP  
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET  
THIRD FLOOR  
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/420,208	Applicant(s) HERMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Chau Nguyen	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-25, and 27-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-25 and 27-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). L3
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Amendment received on 10/27/2005 has been entered. Claims 1, 3-25, and 27-32 are now presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallmann, Patent No. 6,094,684, Lin et al. (Lin), US Patent No. 6,282,575 and further in view of Blum et al. (Blum), Patent No. 6,182,141.

4. As to independent claim 1, Pallmann teaches the invention as claimed, a method for a local computer system to control a remote system over the Internet, comprising the steps of:

initiating a log-in procedure by the local computer system (col. 9, lines 10-65: the machine 102 is able to display to the user the logon process of the internal FTP implementation);

verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system (col. 9, lines 10-65: when using the Internal FTP and the machine prompts for a computer name, it is asking for an Internet system identification);

accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system (col. 9, lines 10-65 and Fig. 23: when using the Internal FTP and the machine prompts for a computer name, it is asking for an Internet system identification);

executing the command through a File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system (col. 9, line 49 – col. 10, line 10 and Fig. 23);

issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system (col. 8, line 57 – col. 9, line 65 and Fig. 23);

transmitting the command as HyperText Transfer Protocol over the Internet (col. 8, line 57 – col. 9, line 65: the machine 102 will have access to the increasing number of World Wide Web pages on the Internet using HTTP protocol);

Pallmann discloses verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system (col. 9, lines 10-65: when using the Internal FTP and the machine prompts for a computer name, it is asking for an Internet system identification). However, Pallmann does not explicitly disclose verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system. Lin discloses a client dials into network access server (remote system), the network access

server communicates with authentication server to verify the user is a valid user to the system (Abstract and col. 4, lines 18-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Lin and Pallmann to include verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system. Authentication server is used to provide authentication services for client computer system, and thus it would prevent unauthorized client to access the system.

However, Pallmann and Lin do not teach processing the HyperText Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command using the server that is remote from the local computer system and forwarding the File Transfer Protocol command to the remote system. Blum teaches a request such as an FTP request is encapsulated within HTTP by an encapsulation routine before reaching a proxy server, and the proxy server must then strip the FTP request from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 11). Blum also discloses all responses received from the remote server will be in native FTP (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 11). Since Blum teaches these limitations in an environment such as a computer system for communicating with a remote server through the Internet which is similar to the system of Pallmann and Lin, thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pallmann and Blum to include processing the HyperText Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command and

Art Unit: 2176

forwarding the File Transfer Protocol command to the remote system in order to provide a number of benefits.

5. As to dependent claim 3, Pallmann and Lin and Blum (Pallmann-Lin-Blum) teach the File Transfer Protocol command includes one of the commands for file creation, directory creation, file change, file removal, Unix file mode, user ownership change, group ownership change, and security permission (Pallmann, col. 14, lines 23-40 and col. 47, lines 14-65: creating, editing, or deleting files, or organizing files under different folder names subordinate to the subdirectory).

6. As to dependent claim 4, Pallmann-Lin-Blum teach the step of logging user commands for each session (Pallmann, col. 9, lines 10-65: when using the Internal FTP and the machine 102 prompts for a computer name, it is asking for an Internet system identification).

7. As to dependent claim 5, Pallmann-Lin-Blum teach the step of issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to upload data to the remote system (Pallmann, Abstract, col. 9, lines 55-65, and col. 11, lines 1-25: the machine 102 can be used with FTP clients that support the `-s:scriptfile` syntax on the command line such as Microsoft FTP).

8. As to dependent claim 6, Pallmann-Lin-Blum teach the data uploaded to the remote system is used to update or configure the software running on the remote system (Pallmann, col. 20, lines 47-63).

9. As to dependent claim 7, Pallmann-Lin-Blum teach the step of issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system (Pallmann, Abstract and col. 9, lines 55-65).

10. As to dependent claim 8, Pallmann-Lin-Blum teach the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program (Pallmann, Abstract and col. 27, lines 33-54).

11. As to dependent claim 9, Pallmann-Lin-Blum teach the step of issuing command-line interface calls from a web-based graphical user interface (Pallmann, Fig. 13 and Fig. 30).

12. As to dependent claim 11, Pallmann-Lin-Blum teach the remote system is comprised of a server computer (Pallmann, col. 10, lines 11-26).

13. As to dependent claim 13, Pallmann-Lin-Blum teach the step of managing a plurality of remote systems from a single web-based control point (Pallmann, col. 10, lines 11-26).

14. As to dependent claim 14, Pallmann-Lin-Blum teach the step of transmitting both commands and content through a same IP port of the remote system (Pallmann, col. 8, lines 29-49).

15. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallmann, Lin and Blum as discussed in claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-14 above, and further in view of Bowman-Amuah, Patent No. 6,332,163.

16. As to dependent claim 10, Pallmann-Lin-Blum, however, do not teach multiple users on a plurality of client computers access the remote system through a single log in. Bowman-Amuah teaches a system that allows users to access services and resources with a single log in regardless of where the user location is or where the resource location is (col. 64, lines 7-27). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pallmann-Lin-Blum and Bowman-Amuah to include multiple users on a plurality of client computers access the remote system through a single login in order to make the system more efficient.

17. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallmann, Lin and Blum as discussed in claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-14 above, and further in view of Sridhar et al, Patent No. 6,324,582.



18. As to dependent claim 12, Pallmann-Lin-Blum teach the limitations as discussed above. However, Pallmann does not teach the remote system is a router. Sridhar teaches client and server computers are coupled to the Internet (handled by the Internet Protocol), which is connected by routers that forward packets towards their destinations (col. 1, lines 43-61 and col. 2, lines 27-42). Sridhar also teaches application layer protocols for file transfer, FTP (file transfer protocol), and for web page access, HTTP (hyper-text transfer protocol) for the system (col. 3, lines 5-13). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pallmann-Lin-Blum and Sridhar to include routers in a remote in order to make the system more efficient.

19. Claims 15-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallmann, Patent No. 6,094,684, Blum et al. (Blum), Patent No. 6,182,141, and further in view of Booth, US Patent No. 6,345,307.

20. As to independent claim 15, Pallmann teaches a server computer comprising:  
an IP port which accepts FTP commands from a client computer system (Pallmann, col. 8, lines 29-56);  
a processor coupled to the IP port which executes the FTP commands (Pallmann, col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 16; col. 6, lines 45-60; and col. 8, lines 29-49);

a first memory coupled to the processor which contains a file system (Pallmann, Abstract);

a first memory coupled to the processor for storing an operating system, wherein a remote user issuing the FTP commands from the client computer can administer the file system (Pallman, col. 44, lines 46-64).

However, Pallmann does not explicitly disclose wherein further the FTP commands are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet. Blum teaches a request such as an FTP request is encapsulated within HTTP by an encapsulation routine before reaching a proxy server, and the proxy server must then strip the FTP request from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode (Blum, col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 11). Since Blum teaches these limitations in an environment such as a computer system for communicating with a remote server through the Internet which is similar to the system of Pallmann, thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pallmann and Blum to include processing the HyperText Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarding the File Transfer Protocol command to the remote system in order to provide a number of benefits).

However, Pallmann and Blum do not explicitly disclose transmitting the command Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol. Booth teaches a proxy server is a type of gateway that allows a browser using HTTP to communicate with a server that does not understand HTTP, but which uses FTP; the proxy server accepts

HTTP requests from the browser and translates them into a format that is suitable for the origin server such as an FTP request, and similarly, the proxy server translates FTP replies from the server into HTTP replies so that the browser can understand them (col. 1, lines 34-45). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Booth and Pallmann and Blum to include transmitting the command Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol for the purpose of enhance communications between users and servers that do not have the same protocols

21. As to dependent claim 16, Pallmann-Blum-Booth teach an FTP server which accepts and HTTP command over the Internet, processes the HTTP command into a corresponding FTP command, and forwards the FTP command for execution by the processor (Blum teaches a request such as an FTP request is encapsulated within HTTP by an encapsulation routine before reaching a proxy server, and the proxy server must then strip the FTP request from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 11). Blum also discloses all responses received from the remote server will be in native FTP (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 11). Since Blum teaches these limitations in an environment such as a computer system for communicating with a remote server through the Internet which is similar to the system of Pallmann, thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pallmann and Blum to include processing the HyperText Transfer Protocol

command into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarding the File Transfer Protocol command to the remote system in order to provide a number of benefits.)

22. As to dependent claim 17, Pallmann-Blum-Booth teach disclose wherein the File Transfer Protocol command includes one of the commands for file creation, directory creation, file change, file removal, Unix file mode, user ownership change, group ownership change, and security permission (Pallmann, col. 14, lines 23-40 and col. 47, lines 14-65: creating, editing, or deleting files, or organizing files under different folder names subordinate to the subdirectory).

23. As to dependent claim 18, Pallmann-Blum-Booth teach a memory coupled to the processor for storing changes made during a session (Pallmann, col. 12, lines 21-33 and col. 19, lines 24-37).

24. As to dependent claim 19, Pallmann-Blum-Booth teach wherein the I port accepts a single FTP script from the client computer system which contains an instruction and which also contains content data uploaded to the server computer from the client computer system (Pallmann, col. 19, lines 55-65: machine 102 can be used with FTP clients that support the -s:scriptfile syntax on the command line; col. 44, lines 46-64: the user's internet browser might be invoked by issuing to the operating system an command that executes the browser and opens data; col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 16: machine 102 can retrieve and process data 102 from data 108 where data 108 is in a

text format, HTML format, image files, audio and video files, and machine 102 also accepts a plug-ins (software program) that might process such files).

25. As to dependent claim 20, Pallmann-Blum-Booth teach wherein the IEP port accepts a single FTP script from the client computer system which causes the server computer to download data from the server computer to the client computer system (Pallmann, Abstract and col. 9, lines 55-65).

26. As to dependent claim 21, Pallmann-Blum-Booth teach wherein the downloaded data is comprised of a computer program (Pallmann, Abstract and col. 27, lines 33-54).

27. As to dependent claim 22, Pallmann-Blum-Booth teach wherein the IP ports accepts command-line interface calls from a web-based graphical user interface (Pallmann, Fig. 13 and Fig. 30).

28. As to dependent claim 24, Pallmann-Blum-Booth teach wherein a plurality of remote systems are managed from a single web-based control point running on the server computer (Pallmann, col. 10, lines 11-26).

29. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallmann, Blum and Booth as discussed in claims 15-22 and 24 above, and further in view of Bowman-Amuah, Patent No. 6,332,163.

30. As to dependent claim 23, Pallmann-Blum-Booth, however, do not teach multiple users on a plurality of client computers access the remote system through a single log in. Bowman-Amuah teaches a system that allows users to access services and resources with a single log in regardless of where the user location is or where the resource location is (col. 64, lines 7-27). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pallmann-Blum-Booth and Bowman-Amuah to include multiple users on a plurality of client computers access the remote system through a single login in order to make the system more efficient.

31. Claims 25, 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallmann, Patent No. 6,094,684, Lin et al. (Lin), US Patent No. 6,282,575, Blum et al. (Blum), Patent No. 6,182,141, and further in view of Booth, US Patent No. 6,345,307.

32. As to independent claim 25, Pallmann teaches the invention as claimed, a method for a local computer system to control a remote system over the Internet, comprising the steps of:

initiating a log-in procedure by the local computer system (col. 9, lines 10-65: the machine 102 is able to display to the user the logon process of the internal FTP implementation);

verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system (col. 9, lines 10-65: when using the Internal FTP and the machine prompts for a computer name, it is asking for an Internet system identification);

accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system (col. 9, lines 10-65 and Fig. 23: when using the Internal FTP and the machine prompts for a computer name, it is asking for an Internet system identification);

executing the command through a File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system (col. 9, line 49 – col. 10, line 10 and Fig. 23);

issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system (col. 8, line 57 – col. 9, line 65 and Fig. 23);

transmitting the command as HyperText Transfer Protocol over the Internet (col. 8, line 57 – col. 9, line 65: the machine 102 will have access to the increasing number of World Wide Web pages on the Internet using HTTP protocol);

Pallmann discloses verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system (col. 9, lines 10-65: when using the Internal FTP and the machine prompts for a computer name, it is asking for an Internet system identification). However, Pallmann does not explicitly disclose verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system. Lin discloses a client dials into network access server (remote system), the network access server communicates with authentication server to verify the user is a valid user to the system (Abstract and col. 4, lines 18-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Lin and

Pallmann to include verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system. Authentication server is used to provide authentication services for client computer system, and thus it would prevent unauthorized client to access the system.

However, Pallmann does not teach processing the HyperText Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command using the server that is remote from the local computer system and forwarding the File Transfer Protocol command to the remote system. Blum teaches a request such as an FTP request is encapsulated within HTTP by an encapsulation routine before reaching a proxy server, and the proxy server must then strip the FTP request from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 11). Blum also discloses all responses received from the remote server will be in native FTP (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 11). Since Blum teaches these limitations in an environment such as a computer system for communicating with a remote server through the Internet which is similar to the system of Pallmann, thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pallmann and Blum to include processing the HyperText Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarding the File Transfer Protocol command to the remote system in order to provide a number of benefits.

However, Pallmann does not explicitly disclose transmitting the command Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol and processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-



Art Unit: 2176

encapsulation. Booth teaches a proxy server is a type of gateway that allows a browser using HTTP to communicate with a server that does not understand HTTP, but which uses FTP; the proxy server accepts HTTP requests from the browser and translates them into a format that is suitable for the origin server such as an FTP request, and similarly, the proxy server translates FTP replies from the server into HTTP replies so that the browser can understand them (col. 1, lines 34-45). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Booth and Pallmann to include transmitting the command Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol and processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation for the purpose of enhance communications between users and servers that do not have the same protocols.

33. As to dependent claim 27, Pallmann, Lin, Blum and Booth disclose wherein the File Transfer Protocol command includes one of the commands for file creation, directory creation, file change, file removal, Unix file mode, user ownership change, group ownership change, and security permission (Pallmann, col. 14, lines 23-40 and col. 47, lines 14-65: creating, editing, or deleting files, or organizing files under different folder names subordinate to the subdirectory).

34. As to dependent claim 28, Pallmann, Lin, Blum and Booth disclose storing instruction comprising the step of logging user commands for each session (Pallmann,

Art Unit: 2176

col. 9, lines 10-65: when using the Internal FTP and the machine 102 prompts for a computer name, it is asking for an Internet system identification).

35. As to dependent claim 29, Pallmann, Lin, Blum and Booth disclose the step of issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system to upload data to the remote system (Pallmann, Abstract, col. 9, lines 55-65, and col. 11, lines 1-25: the machine 102 can be used with FTP clients that support the `s:scriptfile` syntax on the command line such as Microsoft FTP).

36. As to dependent claim 30, Pallmann, Lin, Blum and Booth disclose the step of issuing command-line interface calls from a web-based graphical user interface (Pallmann, Fig. 13 and Fig. 30).

37. As to dependent claim 31, Pallmann, Lin, Blum and Booth disclose the step of managing a plurality of remote systems from a single web-based control point (Pallmann, col. 10, lines 11-26).

38. As to dependent claim 32, Pallmann, Lin, Blum and Booth disclose the step of transmitting both commands and content through a same IP port of the remote system (Pallmann, col. 8, lines 29-49).

### ***Response to Arguments***

In the remarks, Applicant(s) argued in substance that

A) Pallman does not show or suggest: (1) verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system and, (2) "processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command without de-encapsulation using a server that is remote from the local computer system."

In reply to argument A, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, Examiner's never used Pallman reference to reject the limitations (1) and (2). Instead, Examiner's used Lin reference to reject the limitation (1) which is verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system, and Blum reference to reject the limitation (2) which is processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command using the server that is remote from the local computer system as discussed in claim 1 above. In addition, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of

Art Unit: 2176

applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., without de-encapsulation) are not recited in the rejected claim 1. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

B) The cited combination of Lin et al. and Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious "verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system".

In reply to argument B, Pallmann discloses verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system (col. 9, lines 10-65: when using the Internal FTP and the machine prompts for a computer name, it is asking for an Internet system identification). However, Pallmann does not explicitly disclose verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system. Lin discloses a client dials into network access server (remote system), the network access server communicates with authentication server (this authentication server is remote from the remote system and the client's system) to verify the user is a valid user to the system (Abstract and col. 4, lines 18-34). Since Lin discloses using a transmission control protocol/internet protocol network for transferring of information, which is similar to using Internet as a transport mechanism between computers of Pallman, therefore Lin and Pallman are analogous arts. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine

the teachings of Lin and Pallmann to include verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system by accessing a server that is remote from the local computer system. Authentication server is used to provide authentication services for client computer system, and thus it would prevent unauthorized client to access the system.

C) Nowhere in the Lin et al. reference is it taught or suggested that "authorization for a user to issue commands to a remote system is verified by accessing a server that is remote from a local computer system".

In reply to argument C, applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., authorization for a user to issue commands to a remote system is verified by accessing a server that is remote from a local computer system) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

D) The cited combination of Blum et al. and Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious the limitation "processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command using a server that is remote from the local computer".

In reply to argument D, Blum teaches a request such as an FTP request is encapsulated within HTTP by an encapsulation routine before reaching a proxy server, and the proxy server must then strip the FTP request from the HTTP encapsulation

before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 11). Blum also discloses all responses received from the remote server will be in native FTP (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 11). Since Blum teaches these limitations in an environment such as a computer system for communicating with a remote server through the Internet which is similar to the system of Pallmann and Lin, thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pallmann and Blum to include processing the HyperText Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarding the File Transfer Protocol command to the remote system in order to provide a number of benefits.

E) Nowhere in the Blum et al. reference is it taught or suggested that authorization for a user to issue commands to a remote system is verified by accessing a server that is remote from a local computer system.

In reply to argument E, applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., authorization for a user to issue commands to a remote system is verified by accessing a server that is remote from a local computer system) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

F) Nowhere in the Bowman-Amuah and Sridhar references is it taught or suggested that authorization for a user to issue commands to a remote system is verified by accessing a server that is remote from a local computer system.

In reply to argument F, Examiner's used Bowman-Amuah reference to reject claim 10, which is claimed "wherein multiple users on a plurality of client computers access the remote system through a single log in" and Sridhar reference to reject claim 12, which is claimed "the remote system is a router". Also, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., authorization for a user to issue commands to a remote system is verified by accessing a server that is remote from a local computer system) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

G) Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a server computer wherein a remote user issuing FTP commands from a client computer "can administer the file system, and wherein further the FTP commands are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet without File Transfer Protocol components.

In reply to argument G, applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed.

Cir. 1986). In this case, Pallman discloses the user's internet browser might be invoked by issuing to the operating system and command that executes the browser and opens the file linkname.html which is stored in the directory (Pallman, col. 44, lines 46-64). In addition, Examiner's used Blum reference to reject the limitation "wherein further the FTP commands are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the internet", and Booth reference to reject the limitation "transmitting the command Hypertext Transfer Protocol without File Transfer Protocol". Please see the rejection for claim 15 above.

H) Nowhere in the Bowman-Amuah reference is it taught or suggested that a remote user with access to a remote file system can remotely administer a file system using FTP commands that are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet without File Transfer Protocol components.

In reply to argument H, Examiner's used Bowman-Amuah reference to reject the limitation of claim 23, which is claimed "multiple users on a plurality of client computers access the remote system through a single log in". In addition, Examiner's used Pallman, Blum and Booth to reject the limitation argued in argument H, which is similar to argument G above. Therefore, please see response to argument G.

39. Applicant's arguments filed 10/27/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please see response to arguments A-H above.



**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am – 5:30 pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number will change from 703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2176

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
*1/3/2006*